

**REMARKS**

The above amendments and these remarks are in response to the Office action mailed on February 16, 2011. Claims 25, 31-33, 35 and 38 have been amended. Claims 21-24, 29, 30, 41 and 42 have been canceled. Claims 43-58 have been added and are directed to subject matter disclosed in the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 25-28, 31-40, and 43-58 are now pending in this application. Reconsideration on the basis of the above amendments and remarks below is kindly requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 31-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner objected to claims 31-33 and 38 in that the Examiner can not determine what the range of being "reset" was. Claims 31-33 and 38 have been amended to address this objection. The Examiner objected to claims 31 and 35 as not having antecedent basis for "the stops". Claim 31 has been amended to address this objection. Claim 35 does recite "a scale dial with stops" which provides antecedent basis for "the stops" later on in the claim.

The Examiner objected to claim 30, but stated that claim 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 30 was dependent from claim 29, which was dependent from claim 25. Claim 25 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 29 and 30. Thus, applicant submits that claim 25 is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner stated that claims 31 and 35-40 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 31 was indirectly dependent from claim 25. Claim 31 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 25 and 29, and also to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Thus, applicant submits that claim 31 is now in condition for allowance. Claim 35 was dependent from claim 25. Claim 35 has now been amended to include the limitations of claim 25 and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

**Appln No. 10/594,287**  
**Amdt date July 15, 2011**  
**Reply to Office action of February 16, 2011**

Thus, applicant submits that claim 35 is in condition for allowance. Claims 36-40 are all directly or indirectly dependent from claim 35. Thus, claims 36-40 are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 43 has been added and requires "an operating unit comprising a manual follow focus with a picture definition handwheel, . . ." and "an electromechanical actuator of the operating unit for adjusting or readjusting the picture definition adjusted on the picture definition handwheel . . ." These features do not appear to be disclosed by either Gero, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0046938, Preston, U.S. Patent No. 5,092,670, or Shimizu et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,371,240. Claim 48 also requires "an operating unit comprising a scale dial for displaying an adjusted picture definition and/or a delimited adjustment range of the picture definition, . . ." and "an electromechanical actuator of the operating unit for adjusting or readjusting the picture definition displayed on the scale dial . . ." These features also do not appear to be disclosed by Gero, Preston or Shimizu et al. Claim 51 requires "an operating unit comprising a manual follow focus with a picture definition handwheel, which outputs control signals for manually adjusting, readjusting or delimiting an adjustment range of a picture definition to the drive unit, . . ." and "an electromechanical actuator of the operating unit for adjusting or readjusting the picture definition adjusted on the picture definition handwheel or displayed on the scale dial . . ." These features also do not appear to be disclosed by Gero, Preston, or Shimizu et al. Thus, Gero, Preston and Shimizu et al., either alone do not anticipate, or in combination with each other do not render claims 43, 48 and 51 obvious. Thus, claims 43, 48 and 51 should also be in condition for allowance over these references. Claims 44-47 are dependent from claim 43. Claims 49 and 50 are dependent from claim 48. Claims 52-58 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 51. Thus, claims 44-47, 49, 50 and 52-58 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent from an allowable base claim and for the additional limitations that these claims contain therein.

The rejections and objections to all claims pending in this application are believed to have been overcome and this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Appln No. 10/594,287**  
**Amdt date June 15, 2011**  
**Reply to Office action of February 16, 2011**

Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns about the allowability of this application, the Examiner is kindly requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss them.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Constantine Marantidis  
Reg. No. 39,759  
626/795-9900

CM/mml

MML PAS1121359.1-\*07/15/11 11:58 AM